



# MEMORANDUM

To: Dennis Taylor, City Manager

From: Citizen Members of the Budget Committee

Date: December 13, 2006

Subject: **Review of Youth Recreation Services – Final Recommendations**

This memo provides a recap of our work in reviewing youth recreation services. Attached are the detailed minutes from our deliberations as well as a brief summary of our analysis of each program's attributes and challenges, and our recommendations for the future.

## BACKGROUND

At the request of the Eugene City Council, the Citizen Members of the Budget Committee completed a comprehensive review of all existing recreation programs that serve youth in the community and that are funded by the general fund, the local option levy and limited-duration grants. The review was primarily limited to recreation activities and programs provided by the Recreation Division; although discussions were held with the Library, and the Police and Planning and Development departments regarding their services to youth.

## KEY FINDINGS

- All programs and services were deemed valuable and were recommended to be continued.
- Affordability of services is a high priority.
- Service to underserved populations, safety, prevention, close to home convenience, promotion of health and wellness, and a sense of community are important factors when evaluating services and programs.
- The continuing development and expansion of public and private partnerships is critical in the effort to leverage support and resources.
- Providing a mix of services is necessary to adequately serve the entire community.
- There are a number of other programs and services that could be added to address gaps that current programs are not addressing.
- The professional staff is responsive to a wide range of community expectations for youth recreation programs, and has a keen understanding of local and national issues and strategies affecting the successful provision of services. It is important that they remain innovative in their approach, and proactive in their response to the needs of youth and families to ensure quality service delivery.

## STRATEGIC ISSUES

In reviewing the programs and services, a number of strategic issues were identified by the committee:

- **Affordable Services** – The need for more inexpensive, subsidized activities that enable low- income participants to become more active and engaged in the community.
- **Affordable Childcare** – The need for more analysis in an effort to expand affordable childcare.
- **Adaptive Recreation Services** – The need for more activities for individuals with physical and developmental disabilities—especially in the area of inclusion services.
- **Partnerships** – The continuing aggressive pursuit of partnerships to help extend resources, and the involvement of the Neighborhood Associations in planning and implementing special events.
- **Teen Court** – The expansion of this intervention program to more high school regions in Eugene, because of its positive impact.
- **Aquatic Programs** – The addition of a third grade swim program to improve water safety skills for Eugene’s children. Also, there is a perception that lower middle class and moderate income participants are left out of this service provision.
- **Neighborhood-based Activities** – The need for more available activities in each neighborhood. Transportation continues to be a barrier to participation. Churchill and City Central regions are underserved and lack necessary facilities to meet community needs.
- **Outdoor Activities** – Outdoor programs appeal to middle and high school-aged youth that are difficult to engage through traditional programming efforts. Continue exploring partnerships that assist in reducing the high cost of providing this service.
- **Resource Development** – The need for additional funding sources. Explore adding staff dedicated to identifying and securing funds from sources outside the City.

## SUMMARY

- After being fully apprised of the prevention and inclusiveness of these programs, the committee believes they should have a higher priority in future funding decisions.
- The committee views youth recreation services as an investment in our community well being and believe they should work in concert with other city services to create a better common good.
- An investment strategy should be considered to fund youth prevention programs in connection with increases to public safety funding.
- There was a majority consensus to continue all existing programs. In addition, there are a number of youth recreation service needs that are not being met with the current set of programs. The committee recommends expanding programs and services to address these unmet needs.
- The committee reviewed other significant non-recreation youth programs (Safe and Sound, Library, School Resource Officers) and view these services as important for prevention and complementary to recreation programs and services.
- After lengthy discussion, the committee decided not to rank existing programs due to the difficulty in developing criteria that would allow the committee to objectively compare the benefits to disparate populations of such a diverse set of services.

**City of Eugene – Budget Committee  
Citizen Subcommittee on Youth Recreation Service Priorities**

Program	Positive Attributes	Challenge Areas	Recommendations
After-School Community Education (ACE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Free/low cost</li> <li>• Model partnership with 4J</li> <li>• Serves targets audience- low income, diverse</li> <li>• Provides services for family</li> <li>• No cost to City because of grant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short-term grant funding</li> <li>• Reduced in year 4 &amp; 5</li> <li>• Limited number of sites</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High Priority</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>
Academic Cultural Technological – Scientific Olympics (ACT-SO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No cost</li> <li>• Serves diverse population</li> <li>• NAACP partnership</li> <li>• High impact/Mentorship Program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited number of participants</li> <li>• Narrow service group</li> <li>• Competition may limit participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Look to provide programs that meet this need and expand participation beyond those that are based on competition.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>
Adaptive Recreation Programs for Youth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Underserved populations</li> <li>• Limited service providers</li> <li>• Low cost activities</li> <li>• Focus on inclusion</li> <li>• Strong focus on partnerships</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Growing demand for inclusion services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Look for opportunities to expand services in this area.</li> <li>• High Priority</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>
Boys & Girls Clubs of Emerald Valley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Free/low-cost</li> <li>• High number of youth contacts</li> <li>• Diverse patrons</li> <li>• Serves area of Eugene currently underserved</li> <li>• Asset based</li> <li>• Provides nutritious meals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to offset costs through fundraising is difficult.</li> <li>• 3 month reserve</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify expectations with regards to programs and funding.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>
Summer & No-School Day Camps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fills gap in service for childcare</li> <li>• Addresses Health and Fitness</li> <li>• Provides inclusion services</li> <li>• Generates revenue</li> <li>• Out of school services important</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited in Bethel/West Eugene</li> <li>• Cost to City</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to reducing in this area, consider reducing higher cost camps and activities first to ensure access.</li> <li>• High Priority</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>

**City of Eugene – Budget Committee  
Citizen Subcommittee on Youth Recreation Service Priorities**

Program	Positive Attributes	Challenge Areas	Recommendations
Competitive Aquatics, Swimming & Water Polo Teams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Partnerships with schools &amp; clubs</li> <li>Promotes health and fitness</li> <li>Staff development-Jr. Aquatics program</li> <li>Positive economic impact</li> <li>Generates revenue during non-peak hours/maximizes use of pool</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordability</li> <li>Limited pool space/adequate time</li> <li>High cost to maintain and operate pools</li> <li>Serves a limited number of youth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seek additional partnerships to increase access/affordability.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>
Youth Enrichment Classes & Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generates revenue</li> <li>Maximizes community resources through partnerships</li> <li>High demand</li> <li>Fills gaps/music, art, dance introductory language</li> <li>Promotes health and fitness</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unaffordable to some</li> <li>Limited scholarships</li> <li>Limited number of locations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase community access by exploring non-community center sites such as churches especially in Churchill and Whiteaker neighborhoods.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>
Summer Fun-for-All	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable - No cost</li> <li>Services in neighborhoods</li> <li>Serves high need/low income</li> <li>Nutrition-health referral</li> <li>Contributes to neighborhood safety</li> <li>High School youth development</li> <li>Strong partnerships</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High Priority</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>
KidCity Adventures (KCA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High demand</li> <li>Cost recovery is higher than most other services</li> <li>Health and wellness</li> <li>State certified/Facilitates state pay</li> <li>Partnerships with schools</li> <li>Provides inclusion services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited to Sheldon Region</li> <li>Limited Preschool at Petersen Barn</li> <li>Affordability</li> <li>Increasing demand unmet</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explore more partnerships especially in the area of employer benefits.</li> <li>Need to do more analysis in an effort to expand affordable childcare.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>

**City of Eugene – Budget Committee  
Citizen Subcommittee on Youth Recreation Service Priorities**

Program	Positive Attributes	Challenge Areas	Recommendations
KIDSPORTS Scholarships & Field Maintenance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open to all youth</li> <li>• Health and fitness</li> <li>• High demand/high participation</li> <li>• Targets underserved population</li> <li>• Limited providers</li> <li>• Neighborhood based</li> <li>• Prevention based</li> <li>• Reduces access barriers (cost, transportation)</li> </ul>		<b>Recommend Continuation</b>
Learn-to-Swim Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critical community water safety need</li> <li>• Promotes health and fitness</li> <li>• Lifelong skill development</li> <li>• High demand – limited number of service providers</li> <li>• Generates revenue</li> <li>• Prevention based (water safety)</li> <li>• Provides opportunities for youth employment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited number of locations/facilities</li> <li>• High cost to operate pools</li> <li>• Limited number of scholarships available to reduce access barriers</li> </ul>	<b>Recommend Continuation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand to include 3<sup>rd</sup> grade water safety program</li> <li>• High Priority</li> </ul>
Shedd Institute for the Arts – Scholarship Grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fills gap in art and music instruction</li> <li>• Scholarships increase access</li> <li>• Small cost to City</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited number of users</li> </ul>	<b>Recommend Continuation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a perception that the Shedd can continue services through their own fundraising.</li> </ul>

**City of Eugene – Budget Committee  
Citizen Subcommittee on Youth Recreation Service Priorities**

Program	Positive Attributes	Challenge Areas	Recommendations
Outdoor Programs / Spencer Butte Challenge Course	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High demand for services</li> <li>• Partnerships with non-profits</li> <li>• Provides skill development to be safe in outdoors</li> <li>• Well established/respected program</li> <li>• Maximizes revenue recovery</li> <li>• Serves a critical age group (MS and HS) that are difficult to reach in typical recreation programs</li> <li>• Less expensive than aversion programs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordability</li> <li>• Cost to maintain equipment</li> <li>• Low student to instructor ratios</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Look to expand private support</li> </ul> <p align="center"><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>
Recreation & Family Swim Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotes health and fitness</li> <li>• Safe, fun environment around water</li> <li>• Non-structured/family oriented</li> <li>• High demand</li> <li>• Limited number of service providers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost limits access</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explore free swim day</li> <li>• Improve access by reducing admission fees.</li> </ul> <p align="center"><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>
RecZone (After-School Programs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serves middle and high school youth</li> <li>• No/low cost</li> <li>• Neighborhood based</li> <li>• All barriers to service reduced (cost, transportation)</li> <li>• Partnerships with schools</li> <li>• Wide range of services (physical activity, homework, music)</li> <li>• Affordable child care</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited cost recovery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High Priority</li> </ul> <p align="center"><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>

**City of Eugene – Budget Committee  
Citizen Subcommittee on Youth Recreation Service Priorities**

Program	Positive Attributes	Challenge Areas	Recommendations
Special Events & Festivals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports health and wellness</li> <li>• Cultural outreach</li> <li>• Creates sense of community</li> <li>• Low/no cost</li> <li>• Partnerships emphasized</li> <li>• Volunteers utilized</li> <li>• Neighborhood based</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low to no revenue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be more aggressive in involving Neighborhood Associations in planning and implementing special events.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>
Teen Court	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crime prevention</li> <li>• Low cost to operate compared to incarceration.</li> <li>• Large volunteer base</li> <li>• Youth development (peer court)</li> <li>• High success/recidivism very low</li> <li>• No one else providing service</li> <li>• Partnership base (Court, Schools, U of O, DYS)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited to Bethel and Churchill areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider expansion of this intervention to more high school sites.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommend Continuation</b></p>



# MINUTES

Budget Committee  
Citizen Subcommittee on Youth Recreation Service Priorities  
Sloat Conference – Atrium Building  
99 West 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue – Eugene, Oregon

September 21, 2006  
5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Bob Peters, Chair; Terry McDonald, Jana Rygas, John Barofsky, John Demboski, Michael Biglan, Claire Syrett, members; Assistant City Manager Jim Carlson; Kitty Murdoch, Central Services Department-Finance; Angel Jones, Mike Magee, Library, Recreation & Cultural Services-Administration; Renee Grube, Tim Patrick, Rich Fay, Sheree Lloyd, Sandy Shaffer, Craig Smith, Doug Smith, Library, Recreation & Cultural Services-Recreation Division.

**ABSENT:** Mike Clark, member.

Budget Subcommittee Chair Bob Peters called the meeting to order and welcomed those present.

## **I. Review of the Committee Purpose**

Mr. Peters reviewed the task assigned to the committee in June 2006 by the City Council to develop recommendations for funding some or all of the core youth services within the General Fund by FY08, rather than through a local option levy or limited-term grants. He said the subcommittee was directed to perform a comprehensive review of youth services in the current levy and in the General Fund for purposes of its recommendations.

Mr. Peters said the language of the council's motion was somewhat ambiguous but he thought the implication was that there would be no levy to provide additional funds for youth services, which meant that about \$1.146 million would be lost. He quoted councilor Bonny Bettman following the council's passage, who said that a comprehensive review was needed in order to make decisions about service cuts. He did not feel it was the committee's task to recommend specific cuts but rather to perform a comprehensive review of youth services and recommend which programs should be included in the FY08 budget and that could result in a recommendation that all programs be included or even that more programs be added. He asked for comments from committee members.

Ms. Rygas said it was her understanding that budgeting around the Safe & Sound program and projects for homeless youth in part prompted the council's youth services request. She asked where those programs were included in the list of services. Ms. Jones replied that youth services could be found in every department, but list, which included only those programs within Library, Recreation & Cultural Services (LRCS). She said staff determined that because the focus was on the levy the review would be only of programs within the LRCS Recreation Division.

Ms. Rygas said she could see the value of reviewing only the recreation programs but her impression from the Budget Committee discussions was that there was a concern that the

committee was saying yes to programs without a more comprehensive picture of services. She said if that was true then other youth services would need to be included in the assessment. Ms. Jones noted that a summary of youth services, including social services, was developed in response to a request from councilor Andrea Ortiz but the council's request was specifically regarding youth recreation services.

Mr. Peters agreed that the Safe & Sound program was included in the summary of services and thought it should not be categorically excluded from the committee's considerations. He noted that the program was receiving \$160,000 in General Fund money for a five-year period.

Mr. Barofsky asked if the programs to be reviewed were funded partially or entirely by the levy. Ms. Grube said that some programs were funded by the levy, some by the General Fund and some a combination of funding, including grants.

Mr. Peters observed that the council's motion had specifically asked for a review of those programs funded by the levy and the General Fund.

Mr. Carlson commented that the council's request was a result of the council's decision not to go out with a youth levy, recognizing that seven percent of the youth levy was retained by the City for providing youth services. He said the charge from the council was to review those services and determine which should be incorporated in the FY08 budget and beyond. He said the council also decided to only levy half of the library levy and the Budget Committee would ultimately have to determine how to fit \$2.5 million worth of library services into the General Fund. He said the questions before the committee were: which services, if any, should be included in the FY08 budget and were some of the services that had been funded by the levy more important than services that had been previously funded through the General Fund. He said the committee would assist staff to prioritize within the city manager's budget.

Mr. Demboski said it was initially decided not to include dollar amounts in the list of programs and evaluative criteria in the preliminary qualitative information and determine later in the process whether that information should be considered. He noted in council minutes that the maker of the motion that resulted in the committee's task stated the intent for the Budget Committee to review the amount spent on youth services and priorities, whether funded through the levy or the General Fund. He said information about the dollars involved would probably be needed sooner rather than later in the process.

## **II. Youth Recreation Overview and Discussion**

Ms. Grube introduced members of the Recreation Division staff who were present. She reviewed accomplishments since the youth levy was passed four years ago, particularly in the areas of affordability, inclusion and neighborhood services that eliminated transportation barriers. She said those were the gaps in services that were filled by the levy. She said programs had also embraced 40 developmental assets, which was a strength-based approach to all aspects of service delivery and had been a major factor in reducing youth violence and risk-taking behaviors. She said other accomplishments included reinforcement of in-school learning and student achievement, including physical health and fitness, expansion of partnerships and collaborations and completion of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan to provide direction on what the community wanted now and 20 years into the future in terms of recreation, facilities and

open space. She showed a short video highlighting youth services and providing an historical perspective on the evolution of youth programs.

Mr. Peters determined that it was the will of the committee to forego presentations on each program and move forward to a general discussion with staff.

Ms. Rygas asked staff to begin with their opinions about recommendations or adjustments they might suggest. Ms. Grube responded that staff would recommend finding a way to fund all of the youth recreations services within the General Fund as other services had been eliminated earlier and those that remained were core services. Ms. Jones said that her department included much more than youth services and the question was how to prioritize youth services within the larger department. She said it was likely that decisions would be made in other areas before considering youth services as youth was a priority for departments and the City at large and those programs had already been impacted significantly.

Mr. Barofsky remarked that each program had redeeming qualities and felt limited by the lack of dollar amounts. He said the committee needed to find a place for \$1.152 million worth of services and cost was a factor along with all of the other criteria on the evaluation matrix when trying to determine whether a program could or should be in the General Fund. Ms. Jones said that staff understood the committee would make budgetary recommendations and numbers were important but wanted to have the discussion initially center on the service and the value it added to the community before looking at the dollar amounts. She thought it was important to have a discussion of the City's philosophy in the provision of services, which was to identify gaps, look at other service providers, review equity issues and determine that the City's niche was to provide services no one else was or that were not otherwise affordable to some citizens. She said that position had resulted in high-cost, low revenue-generating services in the City's portfolio.

Mr. McDonald asked if there was data available on program use and popularity and whether services had been effective in meeting the mandate to be socially effective. Ms. Jones replied that information about programs was primarily anecdotal.

Mr. McDonald remarked that it seemed likely that some type of raw data on program effectiveness and use was available and asked which the top two programs in addressing community needs were. Ms. Grube said the developmental assets were research based and indicated that the more time that was spent with youth the more effective services were in encouraging positive behaviors. She said that RecZone, outdoor programs and Boys and Girls Clubs were the types of programs that fostered the development of relationships.

Mr. McDonald observed that programs used to be centralized but now were neighborhood-based. He asked which of the park-based programs was most effective. Ms. Grube listed aquatics, KidSports, RecZone and Fun for All as popular, well-used programs distributed throughout the City.

Mr. McDonald asked where the greatest need was perceived to be geographically. Ms. Grube said it depended on the program; Fun for All was placed in sites with a concentration of the lowest income and greatest attendance from year-to-year. She said those sites were typically in West Eugene, the City center and some in the University area where there were parents without childcare options. She said it was not possible to point out one area of the City as being most in need.

Mr. McDonald asked if there was any statistical data that showed a correlation between youth crimes and interdiction by those programs established over the past six years. Ms. Grube said that City-wide the youth crime rate was declining while programs were increasing, so a correlation could be drawn. Craig Smith added that program services were designed based on national research of effectiveness but lack of resources had prevented local studies. He said that national studies were clear that many youth crimes occurred in the after-school time period and services provided during that time did reduce the crime rate. He said the City's service portfolio was extensive, ranging from pre-school to high school and adaptive services, and it was difficult to say which was more valuable. He did not feel that attendance was a predictor of need or effectiveness.

Ms. Syrett was impressed by the wide range of services and pleased that sports was not the only emphasis of programs. She thought that information about who was accessing the programs would help the committee in its deliberations and asked if that was available. Ms. Grube replied that information on age groups and income levels was available in some areas.

Ms. Syrett said it would also be helpful to know if other programs had been developed in the community to fill some of the gaps the City was trying to cover and if there were efforts to continue or obtain more grants to fund some services.

Mr. Peters asked for a copy of the 40 developmental assets as they would complement the evaluation criteria. He also asked for information about joint efforts, partnerships and collaborations to provide services. He said those contributions could be lost if some programs were diminished and it would be useful to know if those programs could continue without the City's involvement. Ms. Grube said that each partnership was unique but in each the City provided a critical component and it would be difficult to continue that partnership without the City's participation.

Ms. Rygas said she did not see an assumption by the council or in the PROS plan that the City had gone too far on youth services and should back off; in fact, the opposite seemed to be true. She said there was no implication that not going out for a levy meant that cutbacks were necessary. She said the council was asking for a review of services but not requiring that programs be placed at the bottom of the list or on a "kill list." She asked for the total budget for Recreation Division youth services, what percentage that was of the LRCS budget and what percentage the LRCS budget was of the General Fund in order to obtain some perspective. She also asked in what other area cuts could be made if they were required.

Ms. Jones stated that LRCS offered a large array of services and hesitated to provide that information as the library levy was a big unknown; going out for only half of the levy meant there was a \$3.5 million dollar problem that would have to be addressed and worst case would be \$5.6 million in reductions if the levy failed. She said vulnerable services included staffing branch libraries and maintaining three year-round and one summer aquatic facilities.

Mr. McDonald asked what staff would add to youth programming that was not currently provided. Ms. Grube replied that she would add a water safety program for every third grader.

Mr. Magee stated that LRCS represented 16 percent of the General Fund and of that 40 percent was recreation.

Mr. Barofsky said the Budget Committee did not intend that all of the shortfall would come from LRCS and that the city manager should look throughout the entire City budget to find funds to continue programs. He asked if there was an error in the statistics for water polo, which indicated there were 700 youth being served but estimated attendance for FY07 was 59,000. Ms. Grube replied that attendance represented the number of times participants were actually in the pool.

Ms. Jones assured the committee that the city manager had not directed her to cut \$3.5 million from the LRCS budget; she was being proactive in reviewing service offerings and determining what reductions could be made within her department's budget.

Mr. Demboski asserted there had been no intimation that youth services were any more or less vulnerable than any other programs in the budget process. He said the committee was given its task only because the council had a work session on the subject of the youth services levy. He said he was a proponent of straight quantitative ranking, although that did not mean that a program at the bottom of the list was dead. He urged the committee to feel safe in ranking services based on quantitative and qualitative criteria without implying a value judgment about lower ranked services and their vulnerability to cuts.

Mr. Demboski noted that the attendance numbers for aquatic services and RecZone were both 59,000 and asked if that was because of broad statistical sampling. Ms. Grube said those were based on actual attendance number and it was coincidental they were the same.

Mr. Demboski observed that one of the stated outcomes of adaptive recreation was reduced public safety costs. He asked what costs were involved and what the basis of that conclusion was. Ms. Grube replied that providing services for people with disabilities helped to keep them healthy mentally and physically and reduce involvement with the public safety system for both families and youth. She conceded that the conclusion was mostly anecdotal.

Mr. Peters, referring to the PROS plan, pointed out a list of criteria on page 50 that were important and should be included in the committee's discussion. He asked if there were other program additions to plan for besides the water safety program for third graders. Ms. Grube said high priority programs included expanded community center hours, more outdoor programs and expanded opportunities to include disabled youth in programs with able-bodied youth (inclusion services).

Ms. Syrett asked if inclusion services were offered currently. Ms. Grube said they were and it was a priority to make all programs inclusive, which would require more trained staff.

Mr. Demboski pointed out that water safety for third graders was included in the PROS plan.

Mr. Biglan mentioned that unlike some earlier specialized budget studies, the review of youth services was comprehensive and looked beyond the current budget crisis to perhaps provide guidance in the future when the City considered services to add.

Mr. McDonald asked about the degree to which non-English-speaking youth were drawn into programs. Ms. Grube replied there were large Korean-speaking and Spanish-speaking populations participating in programs and LRCS had conducted extensive outreach to non-English-speaking communities throughout the City. She said that bilingual staff was being added to promote participation and increase diversity of the staff, including temporary staff.

Mr. McDonald asked what type of outreach was being done to the Spanish-speaking population. Ms. Shaffer replied that outreach was conducted through middle and high schools and community partners using a variety of approaches; however, hiring staff who looked like the kids who wanted to participate was possibly the most effective outreach method.

Mr. McDonald asked if Springfield residents participated in programs. Craig Smith said that participants residing outside of the City were charged 20 percent more to participate in recreation programs; after-school programs were limited to those enrolled in that school or home-schooled.

With respect to the library levy, Mr. Carlson emphasized that not only was the council only going out for half of the current levy but was committed to making it the last library levy. He said the City would phase out of levy funding over the next four years and that could mean using reserves to bridge the gap as programs were adjusted. He hoped there was room in the FY08 budget to absorb some costs without specific impacts but reminded the committee that a majority of the General Fund went to police and fire services. He doubted that those services would be reduced.

Ms. Rygas said looking at return on investment would be a valuable part of the evaluation. She said that some programs served a smaller number of participants but served them more intensely and the committee needed to discuss whether serving a smaller group more intensely was more important than serving a larger group less intensely. She referred to community partnerships like the one with The Shedd and hoped there were opportunities to increase the partner's role over time and perhaps build a donor base around the program. She noted the PROS plan included a number of recommendations about revenue enhancement and suggested the committee discuss options for increased revenue streams for services.

Ms. Syrett reinforced the value of community partnerships and the possibility of some organizations helping to leverage additional funding for programs. She said KidSports, for example, was in existence before the levy and the City's partnership and asked what would happen if the City's support was withdrawn. Ms. Grube said the bulk of the City's contribution was a \$42,000 subsidy for maintenance that had been consistent since the 1970s; the \$20,000 KidSports received as part of the levy funding was to provide scholarships to help with access issues. She said no youth sports were provided through the City and she did not know if KidSports could cover those costs if the City's contribution was eliminated.

Mr. McDonald said that an underlying driver was the fact that public safety—fire and police—were the most expensive core services and anything that reduced use of those services paid high dividends. He wished there was a method for performing a cost/benefit analysis on the extent to which prevention decreased the demand on public safety. He appreciated the fact that LRCS was being proactive to integrate immigrant populations into services.

Ms. Rygas asked if there was information available on the number of youth who were turned away because programs were filled. Ms. Shaffer reported that a recent survey of before and after school childcare programs indicated that virtually every childcare provider had a wait list. She said currently there were 420 youth registered in the pre-school through school-age childcare programs and 128 youth on the wait list. Craig Smith added that there were wait lists for 90 percent of the outdoor program classes. He said the RecZone and Fun for All programs, for which there was no fee, absorbed all participants who came to them.

Ms. Rygas commented that wait lists raised the issue of accessibility. Ms. Jones pointed out that wait lists were for fee-based services and the department operated within its budget. She said that

scholarships were available and some participants were eligible for State funding. Mr. Carlson noted that the amount for scholarships had increased over the years.

Ms. Rygas stressed the difficulty of measuring the performance of programs providing complex services with simple tools and limited resources. She said that often people's impressions of a program's impact in the community were more adequate as a measure than attempts to quantify it.

The committee took a break from 7 p.m. to 7:10 p.m.

### **III. Evaluation Criteria and Process**

Mr. Peters called the meeting back to order. He thanked committee members and staff for a thoughtful discussion of youth recreation programs and directed their attention to the evaluation criteria and process. He noted that several resources such as youth program evaluation criteria used by the Recreation Division, criteria from the PROS plan and a list of the 40 developmental assets were provided but the committee could also develop its own criteria.

Mr. Demboski distributed a matrix he had developed for evaluating programs and possibly ranking them. He explained that each member would complete an evaluation for each of the 15 programs and record personal perceptions. He said a similar matrix could be used to compile information from all members and form the basis for a written report to the city manager.

Ms. Rygas asked if the expectation was to complete the evaluation at the meeting. Mr. Peters replied that there were two more sessions scheduled to accomplish the task of developing youth recreation services recommendations. He said the next meeting was scheduled on October 5, 2006.

Ms. Rygas said she liked the matrix provided by Mr. Demboski and wondered if members' specific perceptions could be coupled with recommendations from staff, who best knew the programs. She also wanted to see the committee's report acknowledge that the committee had found no major problems with programs and recommendations about their importance to the community and long-term sustainability.

Mr. Demboski provided a second matrix and explained how it could be used to statistically tabulate committee members' rankings of programs.

Ms. Syrett said she would be willing to use a ranking approach as long as the method for tabulating results was the one Mr. Demboski had suggested. She liked both matrices and felt it was a viable approach.

Mr. Barofsky said he generally did not object to Mr. Demboski's suggested approach but would prefer to see programs placed in quartiles—the top 25 percent, the second 25 percent, the third and fourth—instead of a straight numerical ranking, which he felt would remove the arbitrary element and result in a fairer consensus.

Mr. McDonald expressed his dislike for charts and graphs, which he felt took on a life of their own once the rankings were committed to paper. He said all of the programs were well thought out by staff and he preferred the following possible approaches:

- a recommendation that no programs be cut,
- a recommendation to add programs,
- if cuts were inevitable, those decisions should be made by professional staff who were most knowledgeable about the programs, or if the previous approaches were unacceptable,
- a recommendation to cut the biggest program if cuts were required.

Mr. Peters echoed Mr. McDonald's remarks with the exception of the last approach since the committee had not been given the task of cutting a certain amount. He noted that councilor Chris Pryor was not opposed to the Budget Committee's review but was reluctant to have a body not trained in recreation services or familiar with the integration of those services start to prioritize them. He agreed for that reason with Mr. McDonald's first three points. He said an alternate approach would be for the committee to be the audience and have staff engage in a dialogue and respond to questions from the committee about individual programs.

Mr. Barofsky said the committee could begin by completing the evaluation matrix and identifying each program's components and how they compared with the idea of perhaps recommending the addition of elements to some of them. He remarked that the council had raised the budgetary issue and referred the matter to the committee for review by members of the public with an understanding of the City's budget. He felt that a comprehensive review of programs as requested by the council could not be done without dollar amounts.

Ms. Jones said that dollar amounts based on allocation factors could be provided for many of the programs but the difficulty was that programs were often part of a comprehensive service delivery system like aquatics. She said that a dollar amount for youth aquatics would not help the committee make a decision because most of the aquatics program costs were in maintenance of facilities and the entire program would have to be considered, not just the allocated cost for youth services.

Mr. Barofsky suggested footnoting the dollar amounts to indicate those types of budgetary relationships. Ms. Grube said the budget system was not set up for that type of cost break but staff would do their best to provide that information.

Ms. Rygas agreed with Mr. Peters' suggestion to turn to the staff for recommendations but they were not likely to suggest any cuts. She like the categories in Mr. Demboski's matrices but did not want to rank programs on a 1-15 scale as it was the type of micromanaging the committee had indicated it did not want to do. She was more comfortable with Mr. Barofsky's suggestion to group programs in quartiles.

Mr. McDonald left the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Biglan listed the various approaches discussed by the committee to provide a unified response to the city manager:

- prioritization of services by averaging individual rankings, quartiles, or categorization
- prioritization of values
- budget strategies to avoid cuts in the future, stabilize funding
- support all programs
- recommendations for future additions to services

Mr. Biglan said the document could provide some future guidance on youth programs through a comprehensive review and recommendations about services. He said that Eugene was unique in the number of institutions conducting research that would be useful in making those types of decisions.

Ms. Syrett commented that the committee might want to make a recommendation to protect existing programs as they were very valuable to the community and should not be changed except to look for opportunities to expand them. She said some programs, such as the Teen Court, might not have all of the program components identified on the matrix but was filling a gap by providing services no other program in the community did. Referring to the youth programs evaluation criteria, she said the criterion related to promising medium to high revenue potential seemed to conflict with the criteria related to reducing financial barriers to participation. Ms. Grube said the intent was to maximize opportunities to generate revenue where possible in order to offer more services. She said that childcare was an example of a program with high demand where raising fees would help to offset the cost of providing the service.

Ms. Syrett questioned whether the City would then be competing with private childcare providers. She thought the point of offering childcare by the City was to fill a gap. Ms. Grube replied that every childcare provider in the community had a waiting list and the City's services did fill a gap by meeting the community's need for consistent, high quality childcare. She said the City did provide scholarships and assist families with State funding, as well as incorporate elements such as inclusion services that other providers did not.

Ms. Jones said the City was very sensitive to providing services that were also provided in the private sector and charged market rates to avoid having taxpayers subsidize a service that could be provided by private industry. She said the only reason the City would provide those services was because they were demand-driven.

Mr. Demboski again cited Ms. Bettman's comments about the intent to have the Budget Committee conduct a comprehensive review of youth programs, including the amount spent on those programs, in order to make decisions about service cuts. He said Ms. Bettman also pointed out that prioritization was part of the purview of the Budget Committee as everything could not be funded and the committee was established to make recommendations to the council.

Mr. Demboski said he understood the concept of prioritization was a hierarchical process and his personal philosophy was that when everything was a priority, nothing was a priority. He said if the committee did not make some choices it was shifting that responsibility to someone else who would have to make those decisions. He felt privileged that the council thought enough of the committee to give it a chance to make recommendations and he urged the committee to respond to the assigned task of a prioritization process.

Mr. Peters said the language in the council's motion was so ambiguous that it could be interpreted either to allow a recommendation to leave programs as they were or to recommended some programs as lower priority. He saw two approaches the committee could take: evaluate each program detail-by-detail, raising every one of the criteria issues in order to complete the evaluation matrix fairly and objectively or continue to raise questions about vulnerable programs and ask staff to assist the committee in determining if some should be in a lower quartile.

Mr. Biglan said an alternative to recommending no cuts or some cuts would be to recommend a specific reduction, such as ten percent, from lower ranked programs. He said that would avoid completely cutting some programs.

Ms. Rygas expressed interest in a review of each program so members could hear comments about a program's strengths or weaknesses to see if patterns developed. She agreed with Mr. Demboski that it was better to conduct the process in a thoughtful manner as a group than have cuts occur later without that process. She hoped that both approaches could be merged to combine a thoughtful review with a recommendation to protect programs.

Mr. Barofsky anticipated developing a document that would concentrate on existing programs and perhaps include a "wish list" of additions to be referred to in the future for guidance when the City's financial situation changed.

Mr. Demboski pointed out that nothing in the committee's assignment required recommending cuts and receiving dollar amounts would be for illustrative purposes and internal committee machinations; nothing coming out of the committee should refer to dollar amounts.

Mr. Barofsky asked that the matrices developed by Mr. Demboski be sent to committee members who could then use the list of program evaluation criteria to complete the forms for the next meeting. He also asked for some dollar amounts to consider as part of the review process and a cost/benefit analysis. He said that the process of completing the matrices would raise a number of questions that could be discussed at the next meeting, leading to a more focused discussion of criteria and recommendations at the third meeting.

Mr. Biglan agreed with Mr. Barofsky's requests, particularly having dollar amount information available to provide a context for prioritization and determining return on investment.

Mr. Peters suggested that Mr. Demboski, Mr. Barofsky and Mr. Biglan develop an evaluation form that combined the most effective elements of the various matrices. He said the form could guide committee members in a preliminary evaluation of each program based on the information provided by staff; those evaluations would be completed prior to the committee's next meeting and help the committee focus its questions at that meeting and perhaps develop a clearer sense of the overall philosophy and approach it wished to take to prioritize or rank programs. He asked that the evaluation criteria and financial information be distributed to committee members along with the evaluation forms.

Ms. Rygas said that if the dollar amounts were going to be used for a cost/benefit analysis there should be a way to account for the higher per person costs of some programs such as specialized recreation, which should not be ranked lower on that basis alone. She said there should be a more complex rating scale than costs alone.

Mr. Barofsky asked staff to provide footnotes that helped to explain any anomalies in the financial information, such as extraordinarily high costs. He also requested any recommendations for youth services that were in the PROS plan but not necessarily on the table so the committee could consider those in its discussion of a possible wish list.

Mr. Peters asked that information on the Safe and Sound program be included in the committee's materials along with the 40 developmental assets.

Ms. Grube said that information on program expenditures and revenues as it appeared in the agenda materials were founded on assumptions and estimates based on percentages of use and attendance. She said those would be distributed to the committee with the other evaluation materials.

Mr. Carlson cautioned that the financial information was not designed for an evaluation purpose and should be considered as just one of the many factors that would guide the committee's deliberations.

Ms. Syrett reiterated her request for whatever demographics were available on the users of programs.

Ms. Rygas asked for a map indicating the geographic location of services around the City to the extent that could be illustrated. Mr. Carlson said a map could be developed for the next meeting that would indicate the location of facilities.

#### **IV. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 8 p.m.

(Recorded by Lynn Taylor)

# MINUTES

Eugene Budget Committee  
Citizen Subcommittee on Youth Recreation Services Priorities  
Bascom/Tykeson Room—Eugene Public Library  
100 West 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue—Eugene, Oregon

October 5, 2006  
5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Bob Peters, Chair; John Demboski, Vice Chair; John Barfosky, Mike Biglan, Terry McDonald, Jana Rygas, Claire Syrett, members; Kitty Murdoch, DeeAnn Raile, Twylla Miller, Central Services Department; Angel Jones, Mike Magee, Renee Grube, Tim Patrick, Rich Fay, Sheree Lloyd, Sandy Shaffer, Craig Smith, Doug Smith, Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services.

**ABSENT:** Mike Clark

## I. OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Peters called the meeting to order. At Mr. Peters' suggestion, members shared something that they had done over the summer.

## II. YOUTH RECREATION SERVICE PRIORITIES DISCUSSION

Mr. Peters reminded the committee of the matrices it had been provided prior to the meeting to evaluate recreation services. He offered the observation that the matrices provided to the subcommittee throughout the process were inconsistent, making evaluation difficult. At his request, several members briefly explained the values and criteria they applied to the matrices to rank the various youth recreation programs and services provided in the community. These included the way the program was primarily funded, whether through participant fees or through the existing levy; how accessible a program was; the income level or at-risk behavior level of participants; the contribution the program made toward participant's and their parents' quality of life; the program's potential for preventing at-risk behavior; the revenue stream generated by the program relative to its cost; the potential a program had for generating private sector support; whether a program was school-, community center-, or neighborhood-based; the balance in program offerings; and if a program was supported by another community partner or partners.

Mr. Barofsky suggested that the department fund a grant writer to generate new grant revenues. He believed the subcommittee needed to empower Ms. Jones and her staff with the direction it wanted to go, or otherwise it would be difficult to develop program offerings that the subcommittee found important because of the many different funding sources that drove what actually was funded. He said it was important to find funding to supplant the levy.

Mr. Peters said that with the exception of the Teen Court, which had objective data about recidivism rates, the subcommittee was unable to gauge program effectiveness. He suggested that some of the programs were blue ribbon programs and others were not, and it was likely staff would like to see the less desirable programs replaced with others that met the City's objectives. The subcommittee had no insight into any of

the programs' quality or effectiveness and staff would have to make that recommendation. He believed that the subcommittee's task would be to advise staff, but it could not be the definitive final voice on the mix of programming.

Mr. Peters noted the information provided by staff about youth services provided by other departments and suggested the subcommittee be prepared to discuss them as well.

Mr. Patrick shared a map entitled *City of Eugene Recreation Services Youth Programs* that included each service area and assigned locations for each service. Mr. Barofsky suggested that the City approach private partners in those areas lacking services to establish new programs. Ms. Grube indicated that was a frequent department strategy and was occurring, for example, with Metropolitan Affordable Housing, where the department was working with the agency to bring programs to housing units. That was not shown on the map but was folded into other programs shown on the map. Ms. Rygas encouraged staff to show those programs on the map as well.

Mr. Barofsky asked Ms. Jones and Ms. Grube to comment.

Ms. Jones expressed appreciation to the subcommittee for the amount of thoughtfulness it was bringing to the review. She said that staff had to evaluate programming constantly to determine what best met the community's needs in a way that leveraged the City's limited resources. Because of limited funding, the department never had the luxury of trying to strategically address the gaps staff perceived, and staff focused on providing the community the services it most needed, often through partnerships with others.

Ms. Grube said that it was difficult to evaluate the programs against each other because they had different strengths and were equally important in different ways. She agreed that the department continually evaluated its programs and had no flexibility to invest in ineffective programs. She acknowledged that effectiveness was often difficult to gauge, but pointed out that Eugene had led the way in its use of the developmental asset approach, which was research-based. Ms. Grube thought the subcommittee's process was subjective and did not know how it could be otherwise.

The subcommittee then reviewed the matrices on a program-by-program basis. Members asked questions clarifying the details and cost of the programs listed, and several subcommittee members shared their rankings with other members. Subcommittee members' comments are bulleted below.

#### *After-School Community Education (ACE)*

- This program does everything we want and is funded outside the budget. It hits all target audiences and the City did not pay for anything for it. The program gets a "lot of bang for the buck" for the targeted youth and is supported by partnerships. (Barofsky)
- Also seeking places where there were more private partnerships. There were many grants for starting new programs but it was rare to find a grant source to fund ongoing programming. It is very unlikely that any long-term grants could be found for the after-school programming. (Rygas)
- The program received the maximum number of points from me—however, it ought to be a school district program, not a City program. (Peters)

#### *Academic Cultural Technological—Scientific Olympics*

- This was a program that I gave both a plus and a minus—it was narrowly targeted, but relatively low cost. A key program component was mentoring, which made it stand out from other programs for me.

It also took advantage of a strong community partnership. (Syrett)

- The program was delivered at a low cost for the youth and through a partnership, but it had a limited number of users. (Barofsky)

#### *Adaptive Recreation Programs for Youth*

- No one else would deliver this service. This is at the core of Eugene's core services. If anything, the City needed to expand the reach of the program so it could serve more people. (Rygas)

#### *Boys & Girls Club of Emerald Valley*

- This program came out high on my rankings. (Rygas)
- My hope is that the City funding provided through the fiscal year 2007 budget would be a one-time bridge. It would be difficult to fold the program into the budget. (Barofsky)
- At what point does the City expect the Boys and Girls Club to provide for its own operational funding? (Demboski)
- The cost for the club to do business was much lower than it would be if the City delivered the service, and the partnership with the club had been extremely cost-effective for the organization and helped meet its targets and goals. The City should partner whenever possible with such community-based, nonprofit sustainable organizations when such partnerships can help it meet its program goals. Please let the subcommittee know if staff had explored other such partnerships or had suggestions for other programs that could be delivered through a partnership. (McDonald)
- Consider partnerships with for-profit entities such as Symantec. (Syrett)

#### *Summer & No-School Day Camps*

- This program has a relatively modest cost. (McDonald)
- Regarding this program and the Boys and Girls Club, they fill a void in the community where there were no other service providers. (Syrett)
- Concur about the gap—think any program that keeps children busy after school keeps them from getting into mischief. (Peters)
- Concerned about components of the programs that have a higher per student cost—might have to cut those programs with higher per student costs in favor of those with lower per-student costs to have something available. (Rygas)

#### *Competitive Aquatics, Swimming, and Water Polo Teams*

- Would like to see other partnerships supporting this program area. (Barofsky)
- Have the perception that the programming serves residents who could afford to pay more. Object that the program “bumps” other pool users for periods during the year and believe that the dollars used for the program could serve a larger number of users than those currently served. (Rygas)
- While the program may be a good one, it seems to serve a very limited group and if something needed to be cut, this would probably be it. (Peters)

Ms. Grube noted the value of the programming for staff development purposes.

The subcommittee took a brief meeting break at 7:05 p.m. Following the break, members continued their review of the matrices.

### *Youth Enrichment Classes & Activities*

- Some of these programs might have been offered by schools ten years ago—the need exists and the programs fill a gap, but the staff assessment appeared to indicate there were parts of the community lacking access. That was an area for improvement. (Syrett)
- Consider more partnerships, such as the use of churches for service delivery in areas lacking access. (Barofsky)
- Suggest staff includes a separate category for facilities and staff overhead costs. (Peters, Barofsky, Rygas)
- Community centers should be accessible to the community as much as possible and not become rental facilities to generate revenue. (Syrett)

### *Summer Fun-for-All*

- Provides much needed service to citizens, provides cultural diversity, has strong attendance, and has good partnerships. A challenge in that a large part of funding comes from the levy. Recommend continuing. (Barofsky)
- Strongly support. (Peters)
- Also support—services are provided in the neighborhood. The partnership with Food for Lane County also added points for me. (Syrett)

### *KidCity Adventures*

- Hope the City can find a way to expand this program to areas other than Sheldon. Can this program be delivered by a private provider at lower cost and still realize a profit? Special needs kids have no other places to go and the City ends up being the only provider of services to children with special needs, which costs more. (Barofsky)

Mr. Demboski asked if anything was being done by any public entity to address the issue of affordable quality child care to meet the clear need that existed. Ms. Grube noted the funding request the Budget Committee had received from the Early Childcare Development Program for the purpose of providing quality low-cost child care some years ago. She said the department continually worked to stay within market and fill a gap. The department recognized the high demand that existed and people like City services because the City provided services others could not, such as access to State payments, inclusion services, and the program was consistently there.

Mr. Demboski questioned how the public or the private child care industry would feel about allowing the program to expand in its current form with additional public moneys. Ms. Jones felt the discussions the department was currently having about the provision of child care should continue as she did not think the need had been adequately addressed.

Ms. Rygas questioned if the money going to direct child care services could not be leveraged by the City for other purposes, such as grants to existing child care providers to pay for facility expansion or training opportunities. Ms. Jones felt the question deserved further exploration. Ms. Rygas suggested that employers of those using the service should help to subsidize the service.

- Are there employers who could provide space for child care services in partnership with the City? (Syrett)

- Private providers can pick and choose who they serve and have no mandate to serve those with special needs, so it fell to the public sector to provide services. (Syrett)

#### *Kidsports Scholarships and Field Maintenance*

Subcommittee members asked questions clarifying the cost of the program to the City but had no comments in this area.

#### *Learn-to-Swim Program*

- Rated a 2—benefits are health and safety, and the program has a large number of users. Would like to see classes for third graders added in partnership with the school districts. (Barofsky)
- Fees limit participation; the City needs to do something to mitigate that. (Peters)
- This area has potential for partnerships with private parties to sponsor scholarships. (Syrett)
- Consider establishing a sliding scale fee schedule to provide relief to low- and moderate-income families. (Rygass)
- Given the Golden Gardens situation, now is a good time to push for reinstatement of the program for third graders. (Demboski)

#### *Shedd Institute for the Arts Scholarship Grants*

- Did not rank this program high—near the bottom of my list. (Peters)
- Liked the program because of its focus on the arts and it was a good community partnership, but believe the Shedd can carry on without City participation. (Syrett)
- Agree but am concerned that the City has a service gap related to the arts and accessibility. (Rygass)

#### *Outdoor Programs/Spencer Butte Challenge Course*

- This program was number one on my list because it promotes physical activity and fitness, provides skills to be safe in recreational pursuits, provides opportunities to enjoy nature and the outdoors, and promotes community through recreational opportunities. The program helped preclude delinquency, filled a gap with services not provided elsewhere, targeted disabled residents, partners with nonprofits to provide services, and realized revenue. (Peters)
- This is a worthy, well-respected program that has a high per capita cost but ranked high on my priority list. (Demboski)
- Ranked the program low although it has some good attributes. The challenges are its high per-individual cost, a need for more partners, and the program's partial reliance on the levy. However, would still recommend continuing the program. (Barofsky)
- Think this program could use more of a skateboarding element. (Barofsky)
- Agree the program fills a need but the money spent could be spent in another program such as the swim program and serve more participants. Think this program could use more private support from interest groups focused on such activities. (Rygass)
- The program serves an age group going through a transitional period and could serve as a deterrent to behavior that would otherwise be addressed by other services such as police at a higher cost. (McDonald)

### *Recreation and Family Swim Program*

- The City has have invested a tremendous amount of money for infrastructure for this program, and that seems to require that every resident can have access, but that is not the case due to the fee structure. The program provides recreation, safety training, and physical fitness benefits. (Rygas)
- Agree—liken the situation to building a new library and then charging access. The public should be able to use the service without worrying about the costs. (Syrett)
- Schedule free swim Saturdays during the summer, or partner with Food for Lane County for admission in exchange for a can of food, to determine if fees were keeping people away. (Barofsky)
- Those who could afford it could pay more. (Rygas)
- Use scholarships as a marketing tool—ask people to buy two admittances at the door and use the money from the second admittance for scholarships. (Barofsky)

### *RecZone (After School Programs)*

- Ranked high due to large number of users, health and fitness benefits, and the partnerships. Challenges lay in high costs and levy funding. (Barofsky)
- This program results in lower policing costs and other benefits. (Rygas)
- This is a basic, bedrock program. (Demboski)
- Agree. (Peters)

### *Special Events and Festivals*

- Ranked the program area higher than expected because it is about community, and more than any other City program brings all residents to one place to do something together at one without regard to origin in the community or ethnicity. (Demboski)
- Also ranked the program area highly—a 2 for me—would like to see more opportunities for partnerships outside partnerships between departments. Perceive a tie between this and the council priority for the neighborhood initiative and the potential of partnerships with the neighborhood associations. (Barofsky)

### *Teen Court*

- The per capita costs are very high compared to other programs, but the program seems to fill a worthy purpose. (Demboski)
- Find the costs per individual to be a pittance compared to what these youth could cost in the long-term. Emphasize the importance of this program. It cannot be cut. (Barofsky)
- Agree about importance of program. Found the peer involvement component of the program unique. (Syrett)
- This is a marvelous, creative, and cost-effective program. The impact of the program on youth was significant and I hope it can be expanded to other schools. (Peters)

### **III. YOUTH RECREATION SERVICE PRIORITIES DISCUSSION AND CREATION OF A DRAFT RECOMMENDATION**

Due to a lack of time, this item was not addressed.

### **IV. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAM PLANNING**

Due to a lack of time, this item was not addressed.

The meeting adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

# MINUTES

Eugene Budget Committee  
Citizen Subcommittee on Youth Recreation Services Priorities  
Bascom/Tykeson Room—Eugene Public Library  
100 West 10<sup>th</sup> Avenue—Eugene, Oregon

October 23, 2006  
5:30 p.m.

**PRESENT:** Bob Peters, Chair; John Demboski, Vice Chair; John Barfosky, Mike Biglan, Mike Clark, Terry McDonald, Jana Rygas, Claire Syrett, members; Kitty Murdoch, Jeff Petry, Central Services Department; Connie Bennett, Renee Grube, Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services; Chief Robert Lehner, Eugene Police Department; Richie Weinman, Planning and Development.

## OPENING REMARKS

Mr. Peters called the meeting to order.

Mr. Clark thanked subcommittee members for their hard work, noting he had missed the last two meetings due to personal commitments.

## I. NON-RECREATION YOUTH SERVICES

Mr. Peters reminded the subcommittee of the purpose of the series of meetings, reviewing the task assigned to the subcommittee in June 2006 by the City Council to develop recommendations for funding some or all of the core youth services within the General Fund by FY08, rather than through a local option levy or limited-term grants. He said the subcommittee was directed to perform a comprehensive review of youth services in the current levy and in the General Fund for purposes of its recommendations.

Although the language of the council's motion was somewhat ambiguous, Mr. Peters thought the implication was that there would be no levy to provide additional funds for youth services, which meant that about \$1.146 million would be lost. He reviewed the task for this evening's meeting, noting the subcommittee would review and amend as necessary after hearing from Angel Jones and a review the Budget Committee's May 17, 2005 motion.

### A. Police Department

Mr. Peters introduced Police Chief Robert Lehner.

Chief Lehner said there were two major areas he would address: the School Resource Officer (SRO) program, for which approximately \$800,000 had been allocated; and special programs, offered on an annual basis and designed primarily for at-risk youth, such as the youth academy and the PAL camp.

Chief Lehner explained that the SRO program was one of only two sworn, prevention programs within the department, the other being the Traffic Enforcement Unit. He said the SRO program was a partnership between the City of Eugene and the Eugene 4-J and Bethel School Districts.

Chief Lehner responded to questions from subcommittee members.

Chief Lehner said prevention measures could not be measured, and it would take a decade or more to evaluate such a program. He stated the SROs regularly handled calls for service at the schools, noting an incident had occurred just today, in which the SRO had been able to respond quickly. He added that there had been three incidents at the high schools since the school year began in September.

Chief Lehner said SROs were assigned to the high schools in Eugene, while they were also assigned to both high schools and middle schools in many other areas of the country. He noted the City of Eugene did not currently allocate sufficient resources to staff middle schools.

Chief Lehner reviewed the types of services the SROs offered. He said the SROs were a presence on campus, talking with students; provided some educational services such as special classes in safety, drivers' education, law enforcement. Additionally, SROs provided a presence at social and athletic events. He saw the SROs as a big part of community policing, in helping youth make good decisions.

Chief Lehner said the high schools were neighborhoods with their own cultures and other associations. He said the program partnered with each of the schools' faculty and administrators to provide the best overall services possible for the students. Although there was no hard data, the SRO program was seen as a significant crime prevention program that provided early intervention in a variety of ways, including abuse and drug use in the students' homes.

Chief Lehner said although some overtime (OT) was used to staff the SRO program, it was more cost effective than hiring additional officers. He stated that the officers assigned to the program were selected from the regular officer pool. He added that department-wide, officers were working significant amounts of OT, which on the negative side had reached what was a maximum amount on a human scale for the officers. He said the primary mission of the SRO was to provide a police presence for the school, as a resource to the students and the staff, and to provide educational opportunities when they presented themselves. He iterated that a law enforcement specific role when needed was at a higher level than desired most of the time. He added that a single officer had been assigned to each high school for over a decade. Chief Lehner said the modern SRO program began in the late 1970's/early 1980's as a cornerstone of community policing nationwide. He added grant opportunities that went back to the Clinton administration, had been reduced or eliminated in recent years.

Chief Lehner said one of the common roles of the SROs was to offer referrals to social services on an informal basis. He said crime and drug interdiction programs for youth had a success rate of over 80 percent with youth, while similar interdiction programs for adults had a success rate of only 20 percent. He stated that the SRO budget was included in the department budget as part of community policing. He said the SRO program represented the only true prevention program staffed by full time sworn officers provided by the City. He added that the budget of \$870,000 funded not only officer wages and benefits, but also vehicles and other equipment, and the schools' programs were believed to be very cost effective.

In response to Ms. Rygas, Ms. Murdoch said the City considered changing the SROs from sworn to non-sworn positions several years ago, but continued to use sworn officers in response to feedback from school principals and the public. Ms. Rygas emphasized the need to establish measurement criteria to ensure money is being spent in the best way. She suggested allocating prevention dollars proportionately with enforcement dollars. Chief Lehner said studies at the federal level indicated \$1.00 spent on prevention today would save \$7.00 in interdiction expenditures including drug and alcohol abuse, child abuse, crime prevention, and others in the future.

Chief Lehner asserted it was important to define prevention, adding that there was little in the area of peer

prevention for youth. He said convincing a large body of youth to refrain from becoming part of the problem was very effective for policing and the community in general. He said prevention activities included after school and child care programs. He said good studies showed that lack of after school programs had a direct correlation to higher crime rates near schools. Mr. Barofsky suggested that the Budget Committee would be inclined to consider additional funding for police prevention activities if a strong proposal was put forth by the department. Chief Lehner cautioned that many prevention activities were recreation activities that, if not funded, would result in higher police budgets.

Ms. Murdoch said the SRO program staffing consisted of five officers and a sergeant. She added that the school districts contributed \$121,000 of the SRO budget.

## **B. Planning and Development Department**

Mr. Peters introduced Richie Weinman, Planning and Development Department Urban Services Manager.

Mr. Weinman said the *Safe and Sound* program was designed to work with vulnerable youth in the community. He said there were thousands of homeless and vulnerable youth in the community, some of whom had disabilities; some were victims of abuse; some came from dysfunctional families whom they had left; some had parents who had substance abuse problems. Many of these youth had no positive adult influence in their lives. A few were runaways from “good” homes, who had run away, associated with other youth who did not provide a good influence and embraced a bohemian life style which created a dangerous environment for them. He added that many of the youth had a daily exposure to violence and fear, most of whom exchanged sex for housing, food and other survival needs. They were often too immature to make good decisions. The youth eventually aged and became homeless adults, where they have less support, and often had children of their own. Sooner or later, they became part of the public safety system, causing more challenges.

Mr. Weinman said the *Safe and Sound* program brought several organizations together to provide prevention and interdiction services. Last year, the Budget Committee approved \$159,720 for additional programming that provided funding for:

- HIV Alliance to work with various partners including New Roads and Station 7 to provide AIDS testing and HIV education for 600 youth, and suicide prevention programs in the Bethel, Eugene 4-J, and Springfield schools for 2,500 youth this year.
- Station 7 to expand daytime operations seven days a week in crisis intervention and counseling.
- Providing mental health support for victims of sexual assault and exploitation to 60 youth at three sites, including the Opportunity Center, Station 7 and New Roads, and mental health outreach for youth on the streets.
- Some funding for emergency client assistance, consisting basic needs such as food and transportation.
- The host home program had gotten off to a slower than anticipated start. It had been determined that opening Station 7 for daytime services had been a better use of resources than host homes.

Ms. Murdoch explained the funding process for the Human Services Commission (HSC) to support the *Safe and Sound* program, and explained the funding through 2011.

Mr. Demboski opined a vote of confidence had been given to the program by the Budget Committee in the spring.

Mr. Barofsky asked why the funding for this program was not going through the normal process.

Mr. McDonald said the HSC had not responded quickly to some emerging issues when they were not perceived as compelling needs outside of the City of Eugene. He added some issues would continue to come to the subcommittee.

Mr. Weinman added that the HSC had been challenged for a long time because, although the City of Eugene had consistently been a generous contributor, other state and federal funding sources had shrunk while needs continued to rise.

Ms. Rygas suggested a more flexible allocation process whereby a percentage of the City's human service funding was allocated to the HSC and a small portion allocated for specific projects.

Mr. Clark proposed that small portion be set aside specifically for needs within the City of Eugene.

Mr. McDonald said it was important to increase funding for set asides rather than reducing funding for the human services base.

Mr. Peters asserted human services decisions were not coordinated but rather made by the United Way, the Federal Emergency Management Administration, HSC, the City of Eugene, the City of Springfield and others. He added provision of medical care had been identified as a high priority and resulted in establishing health care clinics in the high schools to serve the community.

Mr. McDonald said the priorities followed the money, and medical services had been identified as a priority and funding increased because outside funding became available.

### **C. Library, Recreation and Cultural Services Department – Library Services to Youth & Children**

Mr. Peters introduced Connie Bennett, Library Services Director.

Ms. Bennett said a full services program had been offered by the Eugene Public Library (EPL) since moving to the new facility. She said one third of the 400,000 item EPL collection was children and youth materials that were available at the downtown location as well as at the Sheldon and Bethel branches every day.

Ms. Bennett emphasized that equity provided by the EPL, by providing services to anyone who walks in the door; all programs were first come, first serve; bilingual programs for children; ten to twelve programs per week for infants through teens. Ms. Bennett said the EPL had focused on best practices, partnering with the State Library, a leader in the country, and the EPL, a leader in the state in early learning literacy. She added the *Joy of Reading* program was an award-winning program that offered English and Spanish in home assistance. New technology allowed the EPL to participate in the *Homework Help* online subscription program that provided certified online tutors to students.

Ms. Bennett said the EPL children's services staff consisted of 14 employees, or 11.3 full time equivalency (fte) employees at the downtown facility, while staff at the branches provided children's services. She reminded subcommittee members that the library did not generate revenue, charging fees for no services. She said the number of programs for children had more than doubled since moving to the new facility, saying almost 900 programs were provided to 35,000 children last year.

Ms.. Bennett responded to questions from subcommittee members.

Ms. Bennett said although there was room for growth with community partnership activities, they took

staff time to administer, and it was important to support the core programs funded by tax dollars. Fifty-one percent of the library operating budget came from the library levy fund for FY07 and forty-nine percent was General Fund. She said support from the Friends of the Library underwrote programming, and the Eugene Public Library Foundation provided funding for the collection. The long-term strategy for the EPL budget was to shift from levy to General Fund operating funding. She noted 70 percent of the budget funded staffing, and if there were a cut, there would be reductions in hours at the downtown and branch libraries. If significant cuts were required, the first ones would take place at the branches. She explained the variety of funding reductions that would be considered.

Ms. Bennett said the University of Oregon (UO) and the EPL complemented each other, with the UO supporting classes and research. People who were not City of Eugene residents could get a card at the UO or purchase a card for the City of Eugene. The *Reading in the Rain* program was a partnership with UO, Lane Community College (LCC), Northwest Christian College (NCC), the City of Springfield and others. She added that the downtown facility had ten computers reserved for children twelve and under, and would soon have eight computers for thirteen to eighteen year olds. She stated the computers were separated to provide age appropriate use, noting that one of the basic tenets of the EPL was to provide unfettered access for all.

## **II. MINUTES APPROVAL—September 21 and October 5, 2006**

### September 21, 2006

Mr. Barofsky, seconded by Mr. Biglan, moved to approve the September 21, 2006 minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

### October 5, 2006

Ms. Rygas offered the following correction:

Page 6, paragraph 7, should read: This program results in lower policing costs and other ~~good stuff~~ **benefits.**

Mr. Barofsky, seconded by Ms. Syrett, moved to approve the October 5, 2006 minutes, as corrected. The motion passed unanimously.

## **III. APPROVAL OF YOUTH RECREATION SERVICES DRAFT REPORT**

Mr. Peters reviewed the topic as presented in the agenda staff note, and opened the floor to comments from subcommittee members. Those comments are bulleted below.

- Report accurately reflected most of the discussion; did not recall *Demand for services and ability to generate revenue are key components* as being identified by citizen members of the budget committee; inclusion of rankings in the grid did not include an explanation; subcommittee did not agree to include rankings; opposed to including rankings; there was little value to the City Council to have most all options ranked number one. (Syrett)
- Where did staff come up with the numbers for the rankings? (Barofsky)
- Would have preferred to have decimal formula rankings. (Biglan)
- Rankings based on discussions; not scientific. (Grube)
- Need to include more information in summary section; goals and community needs not identified; needs to be linked between goals and programs; target goal to serve diverse populations, needs to

- be reflected in budget; City needs prevention strategy to invest in youth. (Rygas)
- In favor of ranking; illustrates strong support across the board for the programs; regarding ability to generate revenue—the subcommittee did not value revenue generation as a strong point. (Demboski)
- The City Council asked the subcommittee to look at services and make recommendations within a limited scope; priority ranking reflects importance; keep it simple and leave document as it is; ignore non-recreational program data. (McDonald)
- Need to encourage new approaches to finance everything that needed to be done, rather than identifying programs to cut. (Peters)

Mr. Peters summarized the discussion, noting there was consensus that:

- Staff had accurately reflected the subcommittee's values and ideas for funding youth services.
- Youth services had been threatened by a decision to not go out for a youth levy.
- Subcommittee members were unwilling to suggest what should be cut.
- There was a shift to maintain the 1-2-3 priority ranking that reflected a picture of what the subcommittee had been thinking.
- Incorporate a statement that would be a challenge to establish a priority to place youth services at a higher level of protection, and not at the bottom.

The subcommittee took a break from 6:15 p.m. to 6:25 p.m.

The subcommittee reviewed its earlier discussion and clarified staff direction. Summarizing the subcommittee's discussion, Mr. McDonald noted the subcommittee met to consider the charge of the City Council. After becoming apprised of the importance of the prevention and the inclusiveness of programs associated with youth services, the subcommittee came to the conclusion that the youth services programs needed to have a higher priority setting if there came a time for cuts accompanied by a change in policy towards those services.

Ms. Syrett added that the subcommittee viewed youth services as an investment in future community well being, which in concert with other City services such as community policing, library services, services to homeless youth, served an important community function.

Ms. Murdoch and Ms. Grube agreed to finalize the language drafted by the subcommittee for final review and approval by the subcommittee at its next meeting.

In response to Mr. Barofsky, Mr. Peters surveyed the subcommittee to clarify if it wished to maintain the project rankings. Mr. Barofsky, Mr. McDonald, Ms. Syrett, and Ms. Rygas preferred to drop the rankings.

Mr. Peters asked for a show of hands on who wished to have the rankings remain. Mr. Clark, Mr. Biglan, Mr. Demboski, and Mr. Peters wished to keep the rankings in; Mr. Barofsky, Mr. McDonald, Ms. Rygas and Ms. Syrett wished to have the rankings dropped. Mr. Peters declared the vote a tie, and therefore the rankings prevailed.

Following a brief discussion,

Mr. McDonald, seconded by Ms. Rygas, moved to have the rankings dropped from the recommendation. The motion passed 7:0:1, with Mr. Clark abstaining.

Mr. Demboski, seconded by Mr. McDonald, moved that as a *quid pro quo*

of taking the numerical rankings out, that there be no subsequent additions, deletions or changes to the rest of the substantive comments in the positive attributes challenge areas and recommendations that currently exist in the draft matrix, including the reference to The Shedd. The motion passed 8:0.

Mr. Demboski, seconded by Ms. Barofsky, moved to direct staff to incorporate all feedback offered at tonight's meeting into a new draft for review and vote on November 8, 2006. The motion passed 8:0.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Mr. Clark expressed his deep gratitude for Mr. Peters' service on the Budget Committee and its subcommittees. He noted Mr. Peters had done an amazing job and he appreciated Mr. Peters' leadership.

Mr. Demboski acknowledged this as Mr. Peters' last meeting, and presented him with an inscribed gavel as a token of appreciation of subcommittee, the citizens of Eugene and Lane County.

Mr. Peters claimed it had been a privilege to serve on the subcommittee, and extended his appreciation to staff for their commitment to sound accounting and protection of public assets.

## **IV. COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAM PLANNING**

Mr. Peters said the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) would be reviewed at the November 8, 2006 subcommittee meeting. He noted he would not be in attendance at the meeting since his term was expiring.

Mr. Peters directed the attention of subcommittee members to a May 17, 2006 Budget Committee motion:

Ms. Rygas, seconded by Mr. Poling, moved to form a subcommittee to consider these matters open to the participation of those councilors able to attend meetings of the lay members. The motion passed unanimously, 12:0. (Taylor, Pryor, Kelly and Papé were absent.)

Charge:

- Review City basic services accessibility (in Recreation).
- Develop a metric for Human/Social Services in the community.
- Address issues regarding community standards for City contracts.
- Address the Budget Committee process regarding agencies or groups seeking financial support from the City of Eugene.

Ms. Rygas, seconded by Mr. Clark, moved to extend the meeting time for 15 minutes. The motion passed 8:0.

Following discussion about the process regarding the above motion,

Ms. Rygas, seconded by Mr. Clark, moved to extend the meeting time for 5 minutes. The motion passed 8:0.

Following further discussion,

Mr. Demboski, seconded by Mr. Clark, moved to direct staff to schedule 30 minutes at the November 8, 2006 meeting to finish discussing the organization of the subcommittee assignments iterated in the May 17, 2006 motion. The motion passed 8:0.

The meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

(Recorded by Linda Henry)

**Citizen Subcommittee of the Budget Committee  
Minutes Excerpt  
November 8, 2006**

**II. APPROVAL OF YOUTH RECREATION SERVICES DRAFT REPORT**

Mr. Demboski called the subcommittee's attention to the draft report, included in the meeting packet. Ms. Grube briefly reviewed the changes requested by the committee.

Ms. Rygas commended the report. Mr. Peters concurred. He offered a few minor changes, suggesting that in the background section, the text be revised to indicate that the subcommittee reviewed the City's existing recreation programs rather than all recreation programs and that the text related to Teen Court be revised to read "expansion of this intervention to more high schools" rather than specifying two schools.

Mr. Barofsky did not want to wait until the January 2007 Budget Committee meeting for the council to be aware of the draft report, and offered to brief the council on the completion of the report at the next available Public Forum opportunity.

Mr. Peters, seconded by Mr. Clark, moved to accept the draft report with Mr. Peters' revisions, and to direct staff to forward the report to City Manager Dennis Taylor immediately and commission Mr. Barofsky to present the recommendation to the City Council at the earliest opportunity. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Responding to a question from Mr. Demboski, Ms. Murdoch said she would provide the subcommittee with copies of the October 23 minutes for its approval via e-mail prior to sending the report to City Manager Taylor.